

RAPI-009

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the kind allowance of claims 13-27. In the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance it is stated that "[m]ajor emphasis is being placed upon the provision of a specific 'parcel pass switch' in combination with other limitations of the said independent claims and their dependent ones." The Applicant respectfully objects to the emphasis of one element to the apparent exclusion of all other elements. It is believed that the discussion below with respect to claim 1 will highlight other elements that are at least equally noteworthy in light of the prior art.

Claims 5, 8, and 12 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Fostered by the discussion that follows, it is believed that all of the pending claims are patentable and therefore these claims have not been written in independent form at this time.

The title has been amended to make it more indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed per the Office Action requirement. If the proposed title is not suitable, then the Applicant respectfully requests that specific suggestions be made.

The 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 & 103 Rejections

Claims 1, 7, 9, and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by *Baker et al.* (US 5,097,492). Claims 2-4, 6, and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *Baker* in view of *Krug et al.* (US 5,838,758). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Generally, the Office Action states that *Baker* discloses or suggests most of the claim elements and that *Krug* discloses or suggests the rest. However, the *Baker* reference is non-analogous prior art and fails to disclose all of the claim elements.

Baker describes the field of his invention as relating "...generally to the art of tomography, especially to a computerized laminography system for rapid, high resolution

RAPI-009

inspection of manufactured electronic items." (Col. 1, lines 10-13) *Baker* notes that prior to his invention "...no laminography inspection system has yet met with commercial success in an industrial application because of the shortcomings in precision and/or speed of inspection. This is because existing laminography systems have been incapable of achieving the high positional accuracies and image resolutions necessary to solve industrial inspection problems while operating at the speeds necessary to make them practical in a production environment." (Col. 2, lines 36-44) The significance of these statements is that *Baker* has focused on inspection of relatively small items while the presently claimed invention is directed to "parcels" which can be much larger in size. Given the need for "high positional accuracies and image resolutions" it is not clear that the solution of *Baker* applies to all possible inspection objects. Until this has been established, *Baker* must be considered non-analogous prior art which is not allowed. The *Baker* reference should be withdrawn.

As to the rejections themselves, it should be noted that the citations for the rejections lack sufficient support and enablement. The citations are generally one line long, come from scattered portions of the documents with no proof of connection to one another, and contain citations to the claims which may not be self enabling. Without proper support, the rejections should be withdrawn.

With respect to the rejection of claim 1, it should be noted that not all of the claim elements are alleged to be disclosed by *Baker*. This is because *Baker* in fact fails to disclose these elements. As indirectly noted above, *Baker* fails to disclose the claimed "parcel". Further, *Baker* fails to disclose the claimed "generating a screen annotation overlay wherein a combination of said digital x-ray image and said screen annotation overlay produces a screen annotated image". Further still, *Baker* fails to disclose the claimed "at least one inspection station receiving said screen annotated image". The inspection station is distinct from the claimed "at least one screen station". Although never alleged, *Krug* also fails to disclose most of these elements. Without all of the claim elements, the rejections fails to be *prima facie* and should be withdrawn.

RAPI-009

With respect to the rejection of claims 2-4, the Office Action states that it would have been obvious to "provide for an alarm" as in the system of *Krug* to the system of *Baker*. However, this is not necessarily so. The dynamics of the circumstances are markedly different. The system of *Baker* is a quality control system. The system of *Krug* is a security system. Of the two, only the latter has the dynamic of danger to the system operator and/or the public. Further, only the latter has the potential requirement of immediate responsive action. Without proper motivation to combine, the rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of the above, it is respectfully asserted that the cited references can not be said to anticipate or render obvious the presently claimed invention and that the claims are now in condition for allowance.


Request for Allowance

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and an early allowance of this application are earnestly solicited.

If any matters remain which could be resolved in a telephone interview between the Examiner and the undersigned, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned to expedite resolution of any such matters.

Respectfully submitted,
THELEN, REID, & PRIEST LLP

Dated: June 24, 2003



David B. Ritchie
Reg. No. 31,562

Thelen, Reid, & Priest LLP
P.O. Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640
(408) 292-5800